78

Secretary Shultz

Current
Policy
No. 778

Berlin and the Cause of Freedom

United States Department of State
Bureau of Public Affairs
Washington, D.C.

NEWARK PUBLIC LIBRARY

FEB 2 1 1986

U. S. GOVT. PUBS.
DEPOSITORY 378

Following is an address by Secretary Shultz before the Berlin Press Conference, Berlin, December 14, 1985.

Berlin has a very special quality. To visit this great city is to be reminded of the blessings of freedom and of the responsibilities we all face in preserving it. It is a bracing experience for any American Secretary of State. Together with more than 6,000 Americans who are committed to defend your freedom, I am proud to be here.

There is no place where the vital questions facing the West are seen more clearly than in Berlin. There is certainly no place where the benefits of freedom are more evident than in Berlin. But it is sobering to note that there is no place where the threats to our democracy, to our security, and to our way of life are etched more deeply into the landscape than here in this divided city.

I have visited Berlin once before, as a private citizen, in the spring of 1982. I saw a little of it then, free of the duties and without the entourage of a Secretary of State. I admired the treasures of the Dahlem Museum and Charlottenburg Palace. But I was equally impressed by Berlin as a city of today—a city alive, a city still youthful in its energy and freshness and vigorous development.

Berlin can be proud that it is once again one of the most vital and impressive cities in Europe. It is a city that attracts young people looking for education and excitement; it beckons to men and women of many nationalities seeking a fresh start. Its distinguished universities make Berlin one of the outstanding centers of learning in Europe. The genius of German culture flowers at the *Deutsche Oper* and the Schiller Theater, and the Berlin Philharmonic is the envy of the world.

This is also a city where free enterprise is blossoming. Berliners are creating new companies, marketing new products, and trying out new business ideas. In the past 5 years, over 300 high-technology corporations have been established. Universities are working closely with research institutes and private industries. It reminds me of where I lived at Stanford University in Silicon Valley, where the same partnership is so evident.

The flourishing of this city is a tribute to its able leadership. It is also testimony to the character of the Berliner—and, I would add, to the strength and the power of the values that inspire free people everywhere. These values that Berlin represents—this is what I want to talk to you about.

Between East and West

You in this city understand the realities of East-West relations, both their limitations and their possibilities. You are optimists and realists at the same time. Your history since 1945 teaches many lessons—lessons that all of us in the free world would do well to learn as we seek to improve the relationship between East and West. So let me identify these lessons.

First, it is important for us all to understand what all Berliners understand when they look at the cruel wall that divides this city: you know that differences between East and West are far more than mere misunderstandings. Berliners know that coercion and control are the essence of governmental authority on the other side, and thus you understand that guns and tanks and rockets are a manifestation of basic differences, not the underlying cause. There isn't a Berlin Wall because there are weapons; there is a military confrontation because of a political system that is so dependent on force that it builds a Berlin Wall. This is why President Reagan has sought to place U.S.-Soviet arms control issues in their political context. East and West need to make progress on fundamental political differences in order to reduce the risk that our weapons will be used against one another—and in order to reduce the numbers of weapons on both sides.

Second, the political line carved through Europe is not the result of democratic decision by the people who live here. Berliners know that their city and all of Germany are not divided because their citizens decided it should be so. Nearly one-third of the German

S1. 71/4:

people have been denied the right of self-determination. They did not vote to live under a communist system or to be divided from their friends and relatives in the West. And the nations of Eastern Europe have never been given the right set forth in wartime and postwar agreements—including, I should stress, the Yalta agreement—to decide their own form of government and way of life. Quite the contrary, we have seen repeatedly in the postwar years that the people of East Germany and East Berlin and the citizens of Eastern Europe do not wish to live in a continent divided by barbed wire, under governments sustained by military power.

Third, the burning light of freedom dom is an attraction which no amount of intimidation or oppression can extinguish. The wall was built not to keep invaders out but to keep people in. Thus it speaks silently but eloquently about the moral condition of the communist system and about the beacon of liberty which the Western sectors of Berlin have always represented. In West Berlin free men and women, endowed by their Creator with rights and free will, choose their own leaders and shape their own destiny. It was your courage as champions of liberty that led John Kennedy to say in the name of free peoples everywhere that we are all Berliners. All free peoples are in your debt for demonstrating so well, and under such difficult circumstances, the vitality and success of freedom. No one can visit and compare the Eastern and Western sectors of this city and not come away with renewed confidence about freedom's future.

Nor can the visitor to the Western sectors be in any doubt of the peaceful intentions of the West. Why should we desire or risk war, when we can create so much and achieve so much, spiritually and materially, in peace? This is the fourth lesson for us of Berlin.

Fifth, Berliners know that the Soviets will push for advantage when they think they see weakness and indecision. In 1948 they sought to starve this city and force the allies out. They assumed that Berliners, exhausted by war and the exertions of rebuilding a devastated city, would simply give up, and that the United States, Britain, and France would stand by helplessly. But the Soviets did not count on the courage of the people of this city or on the unity and determination of the Western powers, who mounted the greatest airlift in history. When all of us stood resolutely with you and had the power to back up our position, the Soviets had no choice but to call off their blockade. Similarly, we had the strength and determination to stand up to Soviet pressures in later crises over Berlin.

Thus, the sixth lesson is that Western unity, strength, and patience are necessary to make freedom secure. They are also prerequisites of an easing of tensions and fruitful negotiations with our Eastern neighbors. This is the true significance of the Quadripartite Agreement of 1971. Important practical improvements for everyday living, travel, and communications have been achieved because the West was strong and united behind basic principles.

There are other examples. In the past 2 years, Western unity and firmness enabled us to carry through the NATO decision of December 1979 to maintain the balance in intermediate-range nuclear forces in Europe. We were not frightened when the Soviets walked out of the START [strategic arms reduction talks] and INF [intermediate-range nuclear forces] talks in December 1983 and said they would never talk once our missiles were deployed. The alliance held fast, and the Soviets returned to the bargaining table in 1985.

Then the Soviets said they would not discuss offensive reductions—in either START or INF—until the United States agreed to renounce the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). This, President Reagan has made abundantly clear, we will not do. Well, again our firmness produced results. Just over 2 months ago, the Soviets made a counter-proposal. It was deeply flawed, but in it they accepted the principle of deep reductions in offensive forces, on which President Reagan has long insisted. The United States has responded with new ideas of its own, and at the President's meeting with Mr. Gorbachev in Geneva, new impetus was given to the negotiations. Progress in the future, as in the past, depends vitally on Western unity and perseverence.

Challenges for the Future

The United States and the people of Berlin have come a long way together. What of the future?

When President Reagan spoke to the UN General Assembly in October, he reminded us that there can be no true peace where there is repression, partition, or mutual fear, or where we avert our eyes from unpleasant facts. We look to a peace secured by governments responsible to free citizens, to a peace where walls of partition give way to open communication, to a peace based on a balance of safety rather than a balance of terror, and to a peace where the use of force has given way to true observance of the UN Charter by all nations. The only true peace is one based on democracy, freedom, and justice; these principles are the surest foundation of a secure, peaceful, and prosperous world.

This is and will remain our vision. You will remember that President Reagan, when he visited Berlin in 1982, called upon the leaders of the Soviet Union to join him in fulfilling the hopes for unity, peace, and prosperity represented in this city. In his Berlin initiative for peace, the President made new proposals to reduce the threat of nuclear war and to increase contacts among peoples in East and West. Sadly, in 1982, the Soviet Union seemed unable to respond to the President's vision. Perhaps there is greater hope today. In this spirit, let me tell you something of our meetings in Geneva with General Secretary Gorbachev and of our plans and goals for the future.

The Geneva meeting was worthwhile for both sides because it was born in realism and developed into a mature exchange of views and ideas. Everyone in the age of thermonuclear weapons knows that our differences must be contained; our competition must be disciplined by a sense of common risk and an awareness of our common future.

President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev discussed the great issues of our time. The President explained how, in recent years, the American people and our allies have questioned the vast Soviet military buildup and the Soviet record of compliance with past arms control agreements. The President explained our proposals for radical reductions—real, equitable, and verifiable reductions that would make the strategic balance more stable and further reduce the risk of war. He described our Strategic Defense Initiative. He told Mr. Gorbachev that SDI means research into a non-nuclear defensive system—a system for blunting an attack—that threatens no one and that might eventually free all nations from the threat of mutual annihilation. He told him we know that Soviet scientists have been researching the same technologies for 15 years or more, and that Soviet military doctrine has always stressed the value of defensive systems. The President expressed his firm conviction that we should cooperate in moving toward a safer, defense-dominant world, if our research does, indeed, prove successful.

The two leaders agreed to keep negotiating our differences with vigor and purpose—and I consider that a good outcome. We also agreed to give a push to a number of other arms control efforts—such as preventing, pursuant to the 1968 treaty, the proliferation of nuclear weapons; reducing the danger of surprise attack in Europe; and halting the proliferation of chemical weapons. The United States, of course, has proposed a comprehensive global treaty banning chemical weapons.

The two sides also discussed the dangers to world peace arising from regional conflicts. The President made clear that our sympathies are always with those who struggle for freedom against tyranny. But he also stressed that we believe in political, not military, solutions. The two sides agreed to continue regular discussions on these issues at the experts' level, and to begin them at the foreign ministers' level.

The third set of issues we talked about was human rights. History teaches no clearer lesson than this: governments that respect the rights of their own people tend, inevitably, to respect the rights of their neighbors. And the yearning for liberty is a universal phenomenon; indeed, it lies at the heart of much of the turmoil we see in the world. Thus human rights, as the President has said, is not an abstract moral issue—it is a peace issue.

Finally, we discussed the barriers to communication between our societies. Americans want to know more about the peoples of the Soviet Union. And the peoples of the Soviet Union, it seems to us, have a right to know more about Americans—about our desire for peace and about how our free system works. We did reach a new agreement on scientific, educational, and cultural exchanges, and further agreed that they should be broadened in the future.

As you know, Mr. Gorbachev agreed to visit the United States next year, and President Reagan will travel to the Soviet Union the following year. We know the limits as well as the possibilities of summit meetings. Yet we believe the continued face-to-face dialogue of our top leaders could help move us forward. Just as we must avoid illusions on our side, so we must dispel them on the Soviet side. Meetings like this can help dispel Soviet illusions about the resolve of the West. And that is good.

It is worthwhile for the new Soviet leadership to see our resolve firsthand. The world can only be better off if these men see that the democracies will stand firm against pressures—and also that we are ready to deal with them constructively across the broad range of our differences. We will not be bullied; but we are ready for give-and-take in negotiations and for fair solutions to the problems that divide us. These are lessons that we have all learned from the brave people of Berlin. So, what does the future hold for this city?

Not surprisingly, some Berliners are asking why, 40 years after World War II, they are still living under a governing arrangement involving foreign powers. They ask whether this is not the time to make some changes. But I think we all understand the continuing conditions that make these arrangements still necessary.

Soviet and East German goals have not changed in Germany or in Europe. Europe, Germany, and Berlin remain divided. These artificial divisions are themselves a cause of tension. A basic tenet of the Western search for peace must be the overcoming of these divisions. But so long as they remain, the Western allies are prepared to preserve their role and act in Berlin as the trustees of the divided German nation.

What are we safeguarding? First, the precious right of all Germans to self-determination. The division of this city and the division of Germany are unnatural and inhuman. By staying in Berlin and retaining our rights here, we and our allies demonstrate clearly to all the world that we do not accept incorporation of Eastern Europe, including the G.D.R. [German Democratic Republic] and East Berlin, into a Soviet sphere of influence. By maintaining freedom in Berlin, we give evidence of our commitment to freedom in all of Europe.

The Soviets and East Germans know this. Why else would they expend so much effort to wall off and undermine the viability of this city? The flourishing of Berlin is a living challenge to their pretensions and their ambitions. I can assure you that the United States understands very well Berlin's important role in Europe and in the Western world. Our commitment to the freedom of the Western sectors is unshakable. Our insistence on strict observance and full implementation of the Quadripartite Agreement, as it applies to all four sectors of Berlin, remains as strong as ever.

But our responsibilities do not end there. Nor do our goals or dreams for this great city. As President von Weizsaecker, your distinguished former mayor, has said, Americans came to Berlin in 1945 as liberators and became allies and friends. We think in the last 40 years we have also become true partners.

In education, for example, there is the bilingual John F. Kennedy School; the Kennedy Institute at the Free University; the Memorial Library in Kreuzberg; and the Aspen Institute run by New Hampshire-born, but Berlin's honorary citizen, Shep Stone. (I discovered this afternoon when he met my wife that they both grew up in Nashua, New Hampshire—not just New Hampshire.)

We are also partners in industry and development. American industry has invested heavily in this city. Ten percent of Berlin's industrial production is provided by American-owned firms. New investment is also coming, and we in Washington are doing all we can to encourage American companies to come to this showplace city.

We want to do still more—because we believe you want us to be with you in more than a defense and legal capacity, because we are honored to be associated with this great city and its people, and because we have confidence in your future. It is a mutually enriching partnership. We believe that in our continuing collaboration, we contribute an ingredient that makes this city unique among German cities. Berlin is truly an international city, a cosmopolitan city, a place where Europeans and Americans work together for freedom and progress.

Berlin stands today, as it has since 1945, as a model for all of us in the West, as a beacon to all who yearn for freedom everywhere. All who visit this city should contemplate the barbed wire and brick and stone that divide it in two. But they should witness, as well, Berlin's pulsating freedom, dynamism, and spirit. Let them experience firsthand the meaning of liberty, and the courage that sustains it.

This is the real lesson of Berlin today. The renaissance of this great city, as it approaches its 750th birthday in 1987, is a tribute to the faith and values that guide all of us, and an inspiration as we look to the future of the West. ■

Bureau of Public Affairs
United States Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20520

Official Business

If address is incorrect please indicate change. Do not cover or destroy this address label. Mail change of address to: PA/OAP, Rm. 5815A

Postage and Fees Paid
Department of State
STA-501